

Regional Airport Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

9:30 A.M. – Noon
Friday, April 22, 2011
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 8th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

1. Call to Order

Jim Spering called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. RAPC members and other alternates in attendance: Bates, Cisneros, Fredericks, Gibbs, Greene, Henney, Mackenzie, Novak, Martin, Hauri, Barrie, Luce, Bautista, Riggletton, and Palmeri.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Minutes

Mr. Hauri motioned approval of the minutes. Mr. Martin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Regional Airport System Planning Analysis: a) Vision and Implementation Analysis

Mr. Chris Brittle presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Vision and Recommendations. He summarized nine issues along with their recommendations and related work tasks, and asked for committee comment on each:

Issue #1: Changing conditions that alter long-range planning assumptions
Recommendations: 1) track changes in forecasts, runway congestion; 2) use regional forecast for airport planning.

Related work tasks: 1) forecast tracking report/periodic forecast updates; 2) congestion tracking report; 3) multi-region air passenger survey

Mr. Greene expressed his concern on how the Vision is being presented and how it ties into the RASP. He stated that staff seems to be talking about updating the RASP, yet the Committee has not been presented with a description of how the RASP should be changed. He suggested that staff reorganize it into a series of steps and bring back to the Committee as a recommended update.

Ms. Lindy Lowe noted that the draft report has been out since January, 2011 for comment. She replied that the RASP was renamed to the Vision and

Implementation Analysis and is the most recent update and replaces the 2000 RASP.

Issue #2: Lack of regional mechanisms to influence airline decisions about airport service.

Recommendations: 1) regional plans support Scenario B; 2) RAPC should explore ways to engage airlines; 3) regional marketing program for OAK/SJC

Related work tasks: 1) multi-region air passenger survey; 2) regional airport marketing program; 3) new airline route study-OAK/SJC; 4) airport pricing study

Mr. Greene expressed concerns with the regional marketing program. He noted that the San Jose Airport needs to understand more about what that is, because they already have professional consultants, and people on staff that specialize in this area and they would not like to see duplication.

Mr. Martin stated that the tasks would not necessarily be led by MTC staff, and stated that it's important for MTC to work on the multi-region air passenger survey. He commented that each airport has their own marketing staff, so they should continue to work on that along with coordination with RAPC. He also noted that all the airports have their own consultants to work on route studies, and suggested that they continue, as well as the airports continue to work on their own pricing study.

Mr. Luce asked what exactly is the decision that is being supported and who is making that decision. Mr. Spering clarified that these tasks need to be addressed and then identified as to who is responsible.

Issue #3: Difficulty implementing airport-originated demand management programs.

Recommendations: 1) future SFO airline agreements should not preclude congestion pricing; 2) SFO should continue to examine new demand management approaches; 3) Bay Area may need to advocate for FAA controls if SFO's are not enough.

Related work tasks: 1) congestion tracking report; 2) monitor demand management programs at other airports; 3) airport pricing study; 4) general aviation reliever airport strategy

Mr. Martin commented on Recommendation #3, and requested that staff change the word "controls" to "intervention".

Mr. Greene expressed his support, and agreed with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Bates asked how long the congestion pricing agreement is, and what the new demand management approach might be. Mr. Brittle stated that the current airline agreement expires in Year 2021. He also commented on the

new demand management approach, and stated that congestion pricing is a new approach, as well as stretching the limits of how far you can raise the minimum landing fee.

Issue #4: Uncertainty regarding the timing and effectiveness of new ATC technologies.

Recommendations: 1) FAA should provide regular updates to RAPC on NextGen progress; 2) RAPC should engage in advocacy for NextGen funding and Bay Area applications; 3) form coalitions with other regions experiencing major runway congestion problems to increase effectiveness of advocacy; 4) support FAA use of best equipped, first served policy to encourage airline equipage.

Related work tasks: 1) regional airspace study

Mr. Greene expressed concern on the related work task and stated that he's not sure what supports the recommendation to have the Committee do a regional airspace study. He also noted that the FAA is currently doing a regional airspace study. Mr. Brittle stated that it's related to NextGen work, but if the FAA is doing such a study, then staff will not ask for one.

Mr. Novak stated that the FAA just completed a regional airspace study.

Mr. Spring recommended that staff leave the language as-is, and if staff finds out later that the study is complete, then the Committee can get a review of it.

Issue #5: Uncertainty regarding future HSR plans and effectiveness of HSR

Recommendations: 1) periodically review information on effectiveness of HSR in diverting air passengers; 2) with HSR, SFO may need to monitor airline schedules to determine if flight reductions are occurring, or alter demand management program; 3) encourage discussions between HSR Authority and airlines regarding joint ticketing arrangement

Mr. Greene recommended adding a work task that states, "monitor developments of HSR and report back to RAPC".

Issue #6: Uncertainty regarding future role of some alternative airports

Recommendations: 1) if demand increases faster than forecasted, RAPC may wish to update 1976 feasibility study for Travis AFB; 2) protect aviation capability of Moffett Federal Airfield (possible reliever general aviation airport or other roles); 3) continue to involve Sacramento, Stockton, and Monterey airports in Bay Area planning process.

Related work tasks: 1) Travis AFB-Updated Feasibility Study; 2) Moffett Federal Airfield General Aviation Study; 3) Multi-Regional Air Passenger Survey

Mr. Martin recommended adding Sonoma Airport to the multi-region air passenger survey.

Mr. Bates asked about the freight traffic and how it relates to the outlying airports. Mr. Brittle stated that the freight issue is not one that staff has tackled but did note that freight is concentrated at Oakland for UPS and FedEx because it's close to their customers. Mr. Glen Riggleson, representing Hardy Acree, Sacramento Airport, stated that Sacramento had, up until 2009, UPS and ABX (which is under contract with DHL). DHL ceased their operations, and ABX left the facility, which represented about a 40% instantaneous drop in traffic.

Mr. Bates also commented on airline operations, and asked if the airlines are better off when they have a large plane that is $\frac{3}{4}$ full or a small plane that is full.

Issue #7: Projected increase in community noise exposure (2007-2035)
Recommendations: 1) airports should confirm long-term noise trends from this study using more detailed modeling tools; 2) re-examine focus growth projections to lower regional population noise exposure; 3) given SFO's projected noise problem, new approaches may be needed
Related work tasks: 1) Focus Growth review; 2) SFO long-term noise study

Per Oakland Airport's request, no action was taken on Issue #7. It will be brought back to the Committee in June.

Issue #8: Projected increase in criteria pollutants and GHGs
Recommendations: 1) have BAAQMD provide RAPC with annual updates of aviation emissions to determine trends; 2) RAPC should monitor legislation that would reduce aviation emissions and take supporting positions as appropriate
Related work tasks: 1) annual monitoring reports

Mr. Martin asked if staff gave consideration to asking the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to monitor pollutants resulting from aircraft delays. Mr. Brittle stated that staff tried to tackle this type of estimate in the current work, and it proved to be very difficult to do.

Mr. Martin also stated that when the airlines look at delays they look at it strictly from a financial point of view. They are not considering what the impacts are of delays in terms of pollutants, or the economic impact. He suggested that monitoring the loss of jobs may fall under recommendation #1. Mr. Sperling requested staff to reference Mr. Martin's points in the recommendations.

Issue #9: Other – Healthy economy goal

Related tasks: 1) regional airports economic benefits study

Mr. Spring stated that the economic benefits are critical to the economic health of the Bay Area, and he would like to see more emphasis put on this.

Mr. Hauri stated that this is a high priority for General Aviation, so the General Aviation airports need to take ownership of this task and move it forward as well.

Mr. Martin commented on the economic impact study and stated that one idea might be to do an economic impact study every five years, which can take in all of the airports. Mr. Spring stated that it should be done every three years to coordinate with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Brittle recommended that staff meet with Mr. Greene, SJC, and Ms. McKenney, OAK, to discuss their concerns and bring this item back to RAPC in June for action.

In conclusion, Mr. Brittle referred to the memo in the packet which highlights some of the major challenges ahead for accomplishing the proposed work tasks, including the need for staff that can work on airport issues, spelling out commitments from all the agencies involved, and assembling needed resources, which can take time.

Mr. Spring asked staff if they see RAPC making a recommendation to the three regional agencies and possibly to the airports saying that this is our work plan, here is how we recommend it get funded, and this is the dollar amount that is needed from each one of those agencies. Mr. Brittle agreed with that plan, and noted that as RAPC develops the work plan, some of the work will be delegated to the airports to lead and some to the regional agencies.

5. New Business

None.

6. Old Business

None.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 a.m.